

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

THOMAS A. BAYNE, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 2:25-cv-00047-SDN
)	
GOVERNOR JANET MILLS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER AFFIRMING RECOMMENDED DECISION

On April 30, 2025, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court, with copies to Plaintiff Thomas Bayne, Jr., his Recommended Decision to dismiss Mr. Bayne’s complaint and three motions for pretrial relief after a preliminary review of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). ECF No. 15. Mr. Bayne filed additional motions both before and after the Magistrate Judge filed the Recommended Decision, including a motion for issuance of subpoena (ECF No. 14), two additional motions for pretrial relief (ECF Nos. 17, 18), a motion to unseal documents (ECF No. 16), and a motion to stay the matter for additional time to file objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Recommended Decision (ECF No. 19). The Magistrate Judge notified Mr. Bayne that failure to object would waive his right to de novo review and appeal. Mr. Bayne did not, however, file a timely objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Recommended Decision, and the time to file an objection expired on May 21, 2025.

Mr. Bayne premised his motion to extend the deadline to file objections on the defendants’ alleged violation of “all aspects of due process rights” and “creating a procedural issue deliberately to prevent plaintiff from justice.” ECF No. 19. The

conclusory allegations in Mr. Bayne’s motion mirror those which he alleged in the complaint that the Magistrate Judge has already considered in making his Recommended Decision. *See Velez-Padro v. Thermo King De P.R., Inc.*, 465 F.3d 31, 32 (1st Cir. 2006) (“Conclusory objections that do not direct the reviewing court to the issues in controversy do not comply with [Federal Rules of Civil Procedure] 72(b).”). As part of his motion to extend, Mr. Bayne also seeks to consolidate the defendants to “Governor Janet Mills, Bobbie Johnson, Maine State Police, Androscoggin County, Maine, Spurwink, [and] the Town of Lisbon[,] Maine.” ECF No. 19. The Magistrate Judge considered Mr. Bayne’s claims as those alleged pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1983, and Mr. Bayne’s proposed changes to the named defendants would not mend the defects in his claims. Thus, I will not grant Mr. Bayne’s request to extend the deadline to file objections. *See, e.g., Rivera-Aponte v. Gomez Bus Line, Inc.*, 62 F.4th 1, 7 (1st Cir. 2023) (“The choice as to how to respond to a flouted deadline in any particular case is largely for the district court.”).

Furthermore, even if I construe as objections the motions Mr. Bayne filed that the Magistrate Judge did not consider in the Recommended Decision, my conclusion remains the same. The substance of Mr. Bayne’s motion to unseal documents (ECF No. 16) matches his earlier motions for immediate relief and would not remedy any deficiencies in Mr. Bayne’s complaint. Mr. Bayne’s most recent motions for immediate relief (ECF Nos. 17, 18) and his motion for a subpoena fail for similar reasons—the statements are conclusory and do not provide any information to remedy the gaps in Mr. Bayne’s complaint.

Accordingly, I have reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge’s Recommended Decision in light of the record. I concur with the Magistrate Judge’s

conclusions as set forth in his Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary. Further, because Mr. Bayne's complaint does not survive preliminary review, his additional motions concerning pretrial relief, issuance of a subpoena, and unsealing documents are now moot.

Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion to Stay (ECF No. 19) is **DENIED**. The Court **AFFIRMS** and **ADOPTS** the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 15), and Plaintiff's complaint (ECF No. 1) and outstanding motions (ECF Nos. 4, 8, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18) are **DISMISSED**.

So ORDERED.

Dated this 21st day of July 2025.

/s/ Stacey D. Neumann
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE